arXiv:math/0410296v1 [math.CV] 12 Oct 2004

Annals of Mathematics, **156** (2002), 197–211

The extremal function associated to intrinsic norms

By Pengfei Guan*

Abstract

Through the study of the degenerate complex Monge-Ampère equation, we establish the optimal regularity of the extremal function associated to intrinsic norms of Chern-Levine-Nirenberg and Bedford-Taylor. We prove a conjecture of Chern-Levine-Nirenberg on the extended intrinsic norms on complex manifolds and verify Bedford-Taylor's representation formula for these norms in general.

1. Introduction

For every compact complex manifold M with boundary, Chern-Levine-Nirenberg defined in [9] an intrinsic norm on the homology groups $H_k(M,\mathbf{R})$ ($k=1,\ldots,2n-1$), as the supremum of C^2 plurisubharmonic functions in a certain class. A similar norm $\tilde{N}$ was also introduced by Bedford-Taylor [7]. These norms are invariants of complex manifolds and decreasing under holomorphic mappings. In particular, the characterizations of these norms on $H_{2n-1}(M,\mathbf{R})$ are very important in the study of holomorphic mappings. Associated to these norms, there is an extremal function which satisfies the following homogeneous complex Monge-Ampère equation:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{ll}(dd^c u)^n = 0 & \text{in } M^0\\ u|_{\Gamma_1=1} & \\ u|_{\Gamma_0=0}, & \end{array}\right. \tag{1.1}$$

where $d^c = i(\bar{\partial}-\partial)$, M^0 is the interior of M, and Γ_1 and Γ_0 are the corresponding outer and inner boundaries of M respectively.

Based on the dual principle of the calculus of variations, Chern-Levine-Nirenberg conjectured that the intrinsic norm should be equal to a minimum of a certain other class of C^2 plurisubharmonic functions (see (1.9)). Under the

---

*Research of the author was supported in part by NSERC Grant OGP-0046732.

assumption of C^2 regularity of the extremal function u in (1.1), Bedford-Taylor verified the conjecture and observed the following important representation formula in [7],

$$\tilde{N}(\{\Gamma_1\}) = \int_{\Gamma_1} \left(\frac{\partial u}{dr}\right)^n d^c r \wedge (dd^c r)^{n-1}, \tag{1.2}$$

where $\tilde{N}$ (see (1.6) and (1.7)) is the extended Chern-Levine-Nirenberg norm by Bedford-Taylor. Also, Γ_1 is the outer boundary of M and r is a defining function of Γ_1. The identity (1.2), together with Fefferman's boundary regularity theorem ([10]), plays a crucial role in the study of holomorphic mappings on annular domains in $\mathbf{C^n}$ by Bedford-Burns in [2]. The idea of using the complex Monge-Ampère equation to study holomorphic mappings was discussed in [15] by Kerzman-Kohn-Nirenberg.

It is clear that the regularity of the extremal function is the key issue. As the equation (1.1) is a degenerate complex Monge-Ampère equation and a part of the boundary of the manifold M is pseudoconcave, regularity becomes a difficult problem. The existence of Lipschitz solution was shown in [7], and the uniqueness of the solution of the equation is well known (see e.g., [4],[15] and [8]). In some special cases, for example on Reinhardt domains ([7]) or a perturbation of them ([1] and [17]), the extremal function is smooth. Unfortunately, the solution of (1.1) is not in C^2 in general. In [3], Bedford-Fornæss constructed counterexamples with solutions of exact $C^{1,1}$ regularity.

In this paper, we will prove the optimal $C^{1,1}$ regularity of the equation (1.1). Moreover, we will establish the formula (1.2) in general without the C^2 regularity assumption on the extremal function. And we will also verify the Chern-Levine-Nirenberg conjecture for $\tilde{N}$. We will adapt the subsolution method introduced by B. Guan and J. Spruck [12] and B. Guan [11] to deal with the degenerate complex Monge-Ampère equation. One of the crucial steps is the construction of a smooth subsolution in Proposition 1.1.

Before we state our main results, we first recall the intrinsic norms defined by Chern-Levine-Nirenberg, and the extensions of Bedford-Taylor.

Let $\gamma \in H_*(M, \mathbb{R})$ be a homology class in M; define

$$N\{\gamma\} = \sup_{u\in\mathcal{F}} \inf_{T\in\gamma} |T(d^c u \wedge (dd^c u)^{k-1})|, \quad \text{if } \dim\gamma = 2k-1; \tag{1.3}$$

$$N\{\gamma\} = \sup_{u\in\mathcal{F}} \inf_{T\in\gamma} |T(du \wedge d^c u \wedge (dd^c u)^{k-1})|, \quad \text{if } \dim\gamma = 2k, \tag{1.4}$$

where T runs over all currents which represent γ and

$$\mathcal{F} = \{u \in C^2(M) \mid u \text{ is plurisubharmonic and } 0 < u < 1 \text{ on } M\}.$$

The intrinsic norm N may also be obtained as the supremum over the subclass of C^2 solutions of homogeneous complex Hessian equations,

$$\mathcal{F}'_k = \{u \in \mathcal{F} \mid (dd^c u)^k = 0, \dim\gamma = 2k-1, \text{ or } du \wedge (dd^c u)^k = 0, \dim\gamma = 2k\}.$$

When $k = 2n-1$, elements of $\mathcal{F}'_{2n-1}$ are plurisubharmonic functions satisfying the homogeneous complex Monge-Ampère equation

$$(dd^c u)^n = 0. \tag{1.5}$$

In a series of works [4]–[7], based on the fundamental Chern-Levine-Nirenberg inequality and Lelong's work on positive currents, Bedford-Taylor developed weak solution theory for complex Monge-Ampère equations. They extended Monge-Ampère operators for locally bounded plurisubharmonic functions as positive currents, and obtained many important results. In [6] and [7], the variational properties of complex Monge-Ampère equations were studied. In particular in [7], Bedford-Taylor introduced the extended intrinsic norm $\tilde{N}$.

$$\tilde{N}\{\gamma\} = \sup_{u\in\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \inf_{T\in\gamma} |T(d^c u \wedge (dd^c u)^{k-1})|, \quad \text{if } \dim\gamma = 2k-1, \tag{1.6}$$

$$\tilde{N}\{\gamma\} = \sup_{u\in\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \inf_{T\in\gamma} |T(du \wedge d^c u \wedge (dd^c u)^{k-1})|, \quad \text{if } \dim\gamma = 2k, \tag{1.7}$$

where the infimum this time is taken over smooth, compactly supported currents which represent γ and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \{u \in C(M) | u \text{ is plurisubharmonic }, 0 < u < 1 \text{ on } M\}.$$

It is shown that $\tilde{N} \geq N$ and $\tilde{N} < \infty$. $\tilde{N}$ also enjoys other similar properties of N. They are invariants of the complex structure, and decrease under holomorphic maps. These properties are useful in the study of holomorphic mappings. The intrinsic norms can be extended to intrinsic pseudo-metrics on the manifold which are closely related to Caratheodory and Kobayashi metrics.

It was observed in [9] that equation (1.5) also arises as the Euler equation for a stationary point of the convex functional

$$I(u) = \int_M du \wedge d^c u \wedge (dd^c u)^{n-1}. \tag{1.8}$$

Let M be a closed complex manifold with smooth boundary $\partial M = \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_0$, and let

$$\mathcal{B} = \{u \in \mathcal{F} \mid u = 1 \text{ on } \Gamma_1,\ u = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_0\}. \tag{1.9}$$

If $v \in \mathcal{B}$, let γ denote the $(2n-1)$-dimensional homology class of the level hypersurface $v =$ constant. Then for all $T \in \gamma$, if v satisfies $(dd^c v)^n = 0$,

$$\int_T dv \wedge (dd^c v)^{n-1} = \int_M dv \wedge d^c v \wedge (dd^c v)^{n-1} = I(v).$$

The following conjecture was made in [9] by Chern-Levine-Nirenberg.

CONJECTURE. $N\{\Gamma_1\} = \inf_{u\in\mathcal{B}} I(u)$.

Suppose M is of the following form,

$$M = \bar{\Omega}^* \setminus \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{N} \Omega_j\right), \tag{1.10}$$

where $\Omega^*, \Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_N$ are bounded strongly smooth pseudoconvex domains in $\mathbf{C}^n$ where $\bar{\Omega}_1, \dots, \bar{\Omega}_N$ are pairwise disjoint, and $\bar{\Omega}_j \subset \Omega^*$, for all $j = 1, \dots, N$. Also, $\bigcup_{j=1}^{N} \Omega_j$ is holomorphically convex in Ω^* (this is a necessary condition in order for equation (1.1) to have a solution), and $\Gamma_1 = \partial\Omega^*$ and $\Gamma_0 = \bigcup_{j=1}^{N} \partial\Omega_j$. For the solution u of (1.1), Bedford-Taylor proved in [7] that

$$\tilde{N}(\{\Gamma_1\}) = \int_M du \wedge d^c u \wedge (dd^c u)^{n-1}, \tag{1.11}$$

and

$$\tilde{N}(\{\Gamma_1\}) = \inf_{v\in\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} \int_M dv \wedge d^c v \wedge (dd^c v)^{n-1}, \tag{1.12}$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}} = \{u \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}} | u \in \mathrm{Lip}(M) \cup C^2(\partial M),\ u \geq 1 \text{ on } \Gamma_1,\ u \leq 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_0\}.$$

Furthermore, if the extremal function is in $C^2(M)$, the identity (1.2) is valid. And if $u \in C^1(M)$, then

$$\tilde{N}(\{\Gamma_1\}) \leq \int_{\Gamma_1} \left(\frac{\partial u}{dr}\right)^n d^c r \wedge (dd^c r)^{n-1}.$$

Concerning the manifold M in the conjecture, we remark that if $\Gamma = \{v = \text{constant}\}$ for some $v \in \mathcal{B}$, $\Gamma \sim \{v = 1\} \sim \{v = 0\}$ in $H_{2n-1}(M)$. The hypersurface $\{v = 1\}$ is pseudoconvex, and $\{v = 0\}$ is pseudoconcave. If M is embedded in $\mathbf{C}^n$, v is strictly plurisubharmonic, and M must be of the form (1.10).

In fact, we will show the reverse is also true. The following proposition will be used in the estimation of the degenerate Monge-Ampère equations via the subsolution method.

PROPOSITION 1.1. *If M is of the form* (1.10), *there is $v \in \mathrm{PSH}(M^0) \cap C^\infty(M)$ such that $v = 1 + cr$ near Γ_1 and $v = c_j r_j$ near $\partial\Omega_j$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, N$, for some positive constants $c, c_1, \dots, c_N$, where r and r_j are the defining functions of Ω and Ω_j, $j = 1, \dots, N$, respectively. Furthermore,*

$$(dd^c v)^n > 0 \qquad \text{in } M. \tag{1.13}$$

Therefore, we will concentrate on the manifolds of the form (1.10). We now state our main results.

Theorem 1.1 (Regularity Theorem). *If M is of the form* (1.10), *for the unique solution u of* (1.1), *there is a sequence $\{u_k\} \subset \mathcal{B}$ such that*

$$\|u_k\|_{C^2(M)} \le C, \quad \text{for all } \ k, \qquad \lim_{k\to\infty} \sup (dd^c u_k)^n = 0,$$

and $\lim_{k\to\infty} \|u_k - u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(M)} = 0,$ *for all* $0 < \alpha < 1$. *In particular,* $u \in C^{1,1}(M)$.

As a consequence of the regularity theorem, we establish identity (1.2). This identity can be used to obtain the uniqueness of the extremal functions (e.g., Lemma 2.6 in [2]) and, in turn, to study holomorphic mappings. We will discuss these applications elsewhere.

Theorem 1.2. *If M is of the form* (1.10),

$$\tilde{N}(\{\Gamma_1\}) = \int_{\Gamma_1} \left(\frac{\partial u}{dr}\right)^n d^c r \wedge (dd^c r)^{n-1} \tag{1.14}$$

where r is the defining function of Ω.

The Chern-Levine-Nirenberg conjecture for $\tilde{N}$ is also valid. That is, the class $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ in (1.12) can be replaced by a smaller class $\mathcal{B}$ defined in (1.9).

Theorem 1.3. *If M is of the form* (1.10), *then*

$$\tilde{N}(\{\Gamma_1\}) = \inf_{v\in\mathcal{B}} \int_M dv \wedge d^c v \wedge (dd^c v)^{n-1}. \tag{1.15}$$

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we establish C^2 *a priori* estimates for the solutions of the equation under the assumption of the existence of a strictly plurisubharmonic solution. Section 3 is devoted to the construction of the subsolution and the proofs of the main results.

Acknowledgement. This work was completed while the author was visiting NCTS at National Tsing Hua University in Taiwan. He would like to thank Professor C.S. Lin for the kind arrangement and thank NCTS for its warm hospitality.

2. Estimates for the extremal function

Equation (1.1) is a degenerate complex Monge-Ampère equation. There have been many works in this direction. In particular, the work of Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg-Spruck [8] establishes $C^{1,1}$ regularity for solutions in strongly pseudoconvex domains with homogeneous boundary condition. On the other hand, the $C^{1,1}$ regularity of the homogeneous complex Monge-Ampère equation on strongly pseudoconvex domains with arbitrary boundary data was obtained by Krylov [16]. There is also extensive literature on degenerate real Monge-Ampère equations (see [13] and [14] for the references). In our case, some pieces of the boundary are concave. This is the main technical difficulty of the problem. We will incorporate the subsolution method of [11] where interior regularity was treated for pluricomplex Green functions. The existence of a smooth subsolution v of (2.1) in Proposition 1.1 is crucial in the proof of the theorem. This proposition will be proved in the next section.

To establish the existence of the solution $u \in C^{1,1}(M)$, we consider the following equation with parameter $0 \le t < 1$,

$$\begin{cases} (dd^c u)^n = (1-t) f_0 \\ u|_{\Gamma_1} = 1 \\ u|_{\Gamma_0} = 0, \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

where $f_0 = \det(v_{i\bar{j}})$ and v is as in Proposition 1.1. When $0 \le t < 1$, the equation is elliptic. We want to prove that equation (2.1) has a unique smooth solution with a uniform $C^{1,1}$ bound.

Theorem 2.1. *With M as in* (1.10), *there is a constant C depending only on M* (*independent of* t) *such that for each* $0 \le t < 1$, *there is a unique smooth solution u of* (2.1) *with*

$$\|u\|_{C^{1,1}(M)} \le C. \tag{2.2}$$

The *a priori* estimate (2.2) is the key to the proof of the main results. $C^{1,1}$ regularity of equation (1.1) can be deduced directly from the above theorem. In the following proof, we indicate c to be the constant (which may vary line to line) depending only on M (independent of t). We assume the existence of a subsolution v in Proposition 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let $f_0 = \det(v_{i\bar{j}})$. Then $f_0 > 0$, $f_0 \in C^\infty(M)$. We consider $0 \le t \le 1$.

$$\begin{cases} \det(u_{i\bar{j}}) = (1-t) f_0 \\ u|_{\Gamma_1} = 1 \\ u|_{\Gamma_0} = 0. \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

We show that for all $0 \le t < 1$, there exists $u_t \in C^\infty$, u_t plurisubharmonic, such that u_t solves (2.3) and there exists $C > 0$, for all $0 \le t < 1$

$$\|u_t\|_{C^{1,1}(M)} \le C. \tag{2.4}$$

The uniqueness is a consequence of the comparison theorem for complex Monge-Ampère equations (see [4], [5] and [8]). We also note that if (2.4) holds, the equation is elliptic when $0 \le t < 1$. By the Krylov-Evans theorem, $u_t \in C^\infty(\bar{M})$. Therefore, everything is reduced to the establishment of the *a priori* estimates (2.4). In the rest of the proof, we will drop the subindex t.

C^0-*estimates.* Since u is plurisubharmonic in M^0, and $0 \leq u \leq 1$ on ∂M, the maximum principle gives $0 \leq u(z) \leq 1$ for all $z \in M$.

C^1-*estimates.* For any first order differential operator D with constant real coefficients, we consider $w = Du + Av$, where A is a constant to be picked up later. Apply D to the equation (2.1); we get

$$u^{i\bar{j}}(Du)_{i\bar{j}} = \frac{Df_0}{f_0} \; .$$

We also have

$$u^{i\bar{j}}(Av)_{ij} \geq Ac\sum u^{i\bar{i}} \geq nAcf_0^{-\frac{1}{n}}(t-1)^{-\frac{1}{n}} \geq nAcf_0^{-\frac{1}{n}}.$$

If A is large,

$$u^{i\bar{j}}w_{i\bar{j}} > 0 \qquad \text{in } M.$$

By the Maximum Principle for elliptic operators,

$$\max_{\Omega}(Du + Av) = \max_{\partial M}(Du + Av).$$

To estimate Du on ∂M, let h be the solution of

$$\begin{cases} \Delta h = 0 \qquad \text{in } M^0 \\ h|_{\Gamma_1} = 1 \\ h|_{\Gamma_0} = 0. \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

Since $\det(u_{i\bar{j}}) \leq \det(v_{i\bar{j}})$,

$$\Delta u = \sum_{i=1}^{n} u_{i\bar{i}} = nf_0^{-\frac{1}{n}}(1-t)^{\frac{1}{n}} > 0 = \Delta h$$

and

$$u|_{\partial M} = v|_{\partial M} = h|_{\partial M},$$

by the Comparison Principle, $v(z) \leq u(z) \leq h(z)$, for all $z \in M$. Therefore

$$|Du(z)| \leq \max\left(|Dv(z)|, |Dh(z)|\right) \leq c \qquad \text{for all } \; z \in \partial M. \tag{2.6}$$

That is, $\max_{\partial M}|Du| \leq c$. In turn,

$$\max_M W \leq c, \qquad \text{and} \qquad \max_M |Du| \leq c. \tag{2.7}$$

C^2-*estimates.* Since $\det^{\frac{1}{n}}$ is concave,

$$u^{i\bar{j}}(D^2u)_{i\bar{j}} \geq n\;\frac{D^2((f)^{\frac{1}{n}})}{(f)^{\frac{1}{n}}} = n\;\frac{D^2 f_0^{\frac{1}{n}}}{f_0^{\frac{1}{n}}} \; .$$

This yields

$$\begin{aligned} u^{i\bar{j}}((D^2u+Av)_{i\bar{j}}) &\geq n\frac{D^2 f_0^{\frac{1}{n}}}{f_0^{\frac{1}{n}}} + Ac\Sigma u^{i\bar{i}} \\ &\geq n\ \frac{D^2 f_0^{\frac{1}{n}}}{f_0^{\frac{1}{n}}} + nAc f_0^{-\frac{1}{n}} \\ &\geq n\ \frac{D^2 f_0^{\frac{1}{n}}}{f_0^{\frac{1}{n}}} + nAc f_0^{-\frac{1}{n}}. \end{aligned}$$

If we pick $A \geq \frac{1}{c}\max_{z\in M}|D^2 f_0^{\frac{1}{n}}|$, then

$$u^{i\bar{j}}((D^2u+Av)_{i\bar{j}}) \geq 0 \qquad \text{in } \Omega.$$

By the Maximum Principle,

$$\max_{M}\{D^2u+Av\} = \max_{\partial M}\{D^2u+Av\}. \tag{2.8}$$

In order to obtain C^2-*a priori* estimates for u, we need to get the estimates of the second derivatives of u on the boundary of M. The boundary of M consists of pieces of compact strongly pseudoconvex and pseudoconcave hypersurfaces. The second derivative estimates on strongly pseudoconvex hypersurface were established in [8]. Therefore, we will concentrate on the pseudoconcave piece Γ_0 of the boundary. We follow the arguments in [11] with the aid of a strictly plurisubharmonic subsolution v of Proposition 1.1. Let h be the harmonic function of (2.5) in M.

Suppose $z_0 \in \Gamma_0$, let $z_1 = x_1 + \sqrt{-1}y_1, \ldots, z_{n-1} = x_{n-1} + \sqrt{-1}y_{n-1}$, and $z_n = x_n + \sqrt{-1}y_n$. We may assume $z_0 = 0$ and that $\frac{\partial}{\partial z_j}$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_j}$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial y_n}$ are tangential to ∂M at z_0. Set $t_1 = x_1$, $t_2 = y_1, \ldots, t_{2n-3} = x_{n-1}$, $t_{2n-2} = y - n - 1$, $t_{2n-1} = y_n = t$. We also assume $\frac{\partial v}{\partial x_n} = -1$ at $z_0 = 0$.

For all $\varepsilon > 0$, we let $S_\varepsilon = B_\varepsilon(0) \cap M^0$, and define,

$$w(z) = (v(z) - u(z)) + a(v(z) - h(z)) + bv^2(z). \tag{2.9}$$

The constants a and b will be chosen later. The following lemma was proved by B. Guan (Lemma 2.1 in [11]). For completeness, we reproduce the proof (with some minor modification) here.

LEMMA 2.1. *Let* $\tilde{c} = \inf_{z\in M, \xi\in \mathbf{C^n}\setminus\{0\}} \frac{\sum v_{i\bar{j}}\xi_i\bar{\xi}_j}{|\xi|^2}$. *For suitable choices of positive constants* a, b *and* ε,

$$\text{(i)} \qquad Lw(z) \geq \frac{\tilde{c}}{4}\sum u^{i\bar{i}}(z) \qquad \text{in } S_\varepsilon, \tag{2.10}$$

$$\text{(ii)} \qquad w(z) \leq 0 \qquad \text{on } S_\varepsilon, \tag{2.11}$$

where

$$L = \sum_{i,j}^{n} u^{i\bar{j}} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_i \partial \bar{z}_j}. \tag{2.12}$$

Proof of Lemma 2.1. We first observe that,

$$L(v-u) \geq Lv - n. \tag{2.13}$$

Also, as $\mathrm{tr}(v_{i\bar{j}}) \geq n\tilde{c}$ (and by Hopf's lemma),

$$h(z) - v(z) \geq c_0 v(z), \quad \text{for all } \ z \in S_\varepsilon, \tag{2.14}$$

with some uniform constant $c_0 > 0$. Furthermore,

$$L(v-h) \geq -C_1 \sum u^{i\bar{i}},$$

for some uniform positive constant C_1 as $h \in C^2$. We also have,

$$L(v^2) = 2vLv + 2\sum u^{i\bar{j}} v_i v_{\bar{j}} \geq 0.$$

Therefore, as a and b are positive,

$$Lw \geq -aC_1 \sum u^{i\bar{i}} + (1 + 2bV)Lv + 2b\sum u^{i\bar{j}} v_i v_{\bar{j}} - n. \tag{2.15}$$

Now, as $\frac{\partial v}{\partial x_n} = -1$ at $z_0 = 0$ and $Tv(0) = 0$ for any tangential vector field T, if $\varepsilon > 0$ is small,

$$\sum u^{i\bar{j}} v_i v_{\bar{j}} \geq u^{n\bar{n}} v_n v_{\bar{n}} - C_3 \varepsilon \sum u^{i\bar{i}} \tag{2.16}$$

for some positive constant C_3 under control. By the geometric inequality,

$$\frac{\tilde{c}}{4} \sum u^{i\bar{i}} + bu^{n\bar{n}} \geq \frac{n(\frac{\tilde{c}}{4})^{\frac{n-1}{n}} (\frac{\tilde{c}}{4} + b)^{\frac{1}{n}}}{(\prod_i u_{i\bar{i}})^{\frac{1}{n}}} \geq \frac{n(\frac{\tilde{c}}{4})^{\frac{n-1}{n}} b^{\frac{1}{n}}}{\det^{\frac{1}{n}} u_{i\bar{j}}}. \tag{2.17}$$

Since $\det(u_{i\bar{j}}) = (1-t) f_0 \leq f_0$, we pick b such that

$$\inf_{z \in M} \{ \frac{n(\frac{\tilde{c}}{4})^{\frac{n-1}{n}} b^{\frac{1}{n}}}{\det^{\frac{1}{n}} v_{i\bar{j}}(z)} \} \geq n. \tag{2.18}$$

Putting (2.17), (2.16) and (2.18) into (2.15), we obtain

$$Lw \geq -(aC_1 + 2C_3 b\varepsilon + \frac{\tilde{c}}{4} \sum u^{i\bar{i}}) + (1 + 2bv)Lv. \tag{2.19}$$

Since $v > 0$ is dominated by ε in S_ε, and $Lv \geq \tilde{c} \sum u^{i\bar{i}}$, if we choose $a = \frac{\tilde{c}}{1+C_1}$ and ε small, (2.10) follows from (2.19).

To examine values of w in S_ε, we note that $v = 0$ on $\partial\Gamma_0$. By Hopf's lemma, if ε is sufficiently small, for c_0 as in (2.14),

$$w \leq -ac_0 v + bv^2 \leq 0.$$

The proof of the lemma is complete. □

Now, back to the proof of Theorem 2.1: Let

$$T_\alpha = \frac{\partial}{\partial t_\alpha} - \frac{v_{t_\alpha}}{v_{x_n}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_n}. \tag{2.20}$$

Let

$$\tilde{w}(z) = w(z) = \pm T_\alpha u(z) + u_t^2(z) + \tilde{C}w(z) - B|z|^2,$$

where B and $\tilde{C}$ are certain constants to be picked later.

By [8],

$$L(\pm T_\alpha u(z) + u_t^2(z)) \geq -c(1 + \sum u^{i\bar{i}}),$$

in S_ε. From the above lemma, if we pick $\tilde{C}$ and B large enough, with $\tilde{C}$ sufficiently larger than B (as $\sum u^{i\bar{i}} \geq \det^{-\frac{1}{n}} u_{i\bar{j}} \geq f_0$), we will have

$$\text{(i)} \qquad L(\tilde{w})(z) \geq 0 \qquad \text{in} S_\varepsilon, \tag{2.21}$$

$$\text{(ii)} \qquad \tilde{w}(z) \leq 0 \qquad \text{on } \partial S_\varepsilon, \tag{2.22}$$

Since $w(0) = 0$, we must have $w_{x_n}(0) \leq 0$. As a consequence, $|u_{x_n t_\alpha}(0)| \leq C$.

Near Γ_0, $u(z) = \sigma(z)v(z)$. But $u(z) \geq v(z) \geq 0$, for all $z \in M$, so that $\sigma(z) \geq 1$. On the other hand, if $\vec{n}$ is the normal to Γ_0,

$$u_n = \sigma v_n, \quad \text{for all } \ z \in \Gamma_0.$$

As $|Du|$ is bounded in M, $u_n \leq 0$ and $v_n = -1$ on Γ_0, so $1 \leq \sigma \leq c$. On Γ_0, we have

$$u_{i\bar{j}}(z) = \sigma(z) v_{i\bar{j}}(z), \qquad \text{for all } \ i, j \leq n-1.$$

It follows that

$$cI_{n-1} \geq u_{i\bar{j}}(z) \geq v_{i\bar{j}}(z) \geq I_{n-1}, \quad \text{for all } \ z \in \Gamma_0, \quad \text{for all } \ i, j \leq n-1, \tag{2.23}$$

where I_{n-1} is the $(n-1)$-dim identity matrix.

This gives tangential second derivative bounds. To estimate $u_{x_n x_n}(0)$, we note that

$$u_{x_n x_n}(0) = 4u_{n\bar{n}}(0) - u_{y_n y_n}(0).$$

We only need to estimate $u_{n\bar{n}}(0)$. Since $u_{i\bar{n}}(0)$ and $u_{n\bar{i}}(0)$ are bounded, $u_{n\bar{n}}(0)$ can be estimated by (2.23) and equation (2.3). In conclusion,

$$\|u\|_{C^2(M)} \leq c, \qquad \text{for all } \ 0 \leq t < 1. \tag{2.24}$$

Finally, the higher regularity for the solution of the equation (2.3) for $0 \leq t < 1$ follows from the Evans-Krylov theorem and the Schauder theorem. The existence follows from standard elliptic theory for the Dirichlet problem.

$\square$

3. Existence of subsolutions

We construct in this section a strictly smooth plurisubharmonic function with the same boundary value as the solution u of equation (1.1). We begin with some useful elementary lemmas.

Lemma 3.1. *For all $\delta > 0$, there is an even function $h(t) \in C^\infty(\mathbf{R})$, such that*

(i) $h(t) \geq |t|$, *for all* $t \in \mathbf{R}$,x $h(t) = |t|$, *for all* $|t| \geq \delta$;

(ii) $|h'(t)| \leq 1$ *and* $h''(t) \geq 0$, *for all* $t \in \mathbf{R}$ *and* $h'(t) \geq 0$, *for all* $t \geq 0$.

Proof. For all $\varepsilon > 0$, let $\rho_\varepsilon(s) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\rho\left(\frac{s}{\varepsilon}\right)$, where ρ is a standard nonnegative smooth even function supported in $|s| \leq 1$ with $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \rho(s)ds = 1$. Set

$$\tilde{h}_\varepsilon(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{t} \rho_\varepsilon(s)ds - \int_{t}^{\infty} \rho_\varepsilon(s)ds.$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{h}'_\varepsilon(t) &= 2\rho_\varepsilon(t) \geq 0, \\ |\tilde{h}_\varepsilon(t)| &\leq \int_{-\infty}^{t} \rho_\varepsilon(s)ds + \int_{t}^{\infty} \rho_\varepsilon(s)ds \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \rho_\varepsilon(s)ds = 1, \qquad \text{for all} \quad t \in \mathbf{R}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\tilde{h}_\varepsilon(t) = 1, \text{ if } t > 2\varepsilon, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{h}_\varepsilon(t) = -1, \text{ if } t < -2\varepsilon.$$

We also have,

$$\tilde{h}_\varepsilon(t) \geq 0, \text{ if } t \geq 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{h}_\varepsilon(t) \leq 0, \text{ if } t \leq 0.$$

Since $\rho_\varepsilon(s)$ is nonnegative and even,

$$\tilde{h}_\varepsilon(t) = -\tilde{h}_\varepsilon(-t).$$

Now, for $\varepsilon = \frac{\delta}{2}$, set

$$h(t) = \int_0^t \tilde{h}_\varepsilon(s)ds + \left(1 - \int_0^1 \tilde{h}_\varepsilon(s)ds\right).$$

We have

$$h(t) = h(-t), \qquad h'(t) = \tilde{h}_\varepsilon(t),$$

so that $th'(t) \geq 0$, for all t. Also

$$|h'(t)| = |\tilde{h}_\varepsilon(t)| \leq 1.$$

Since $h(1) = 1$ and $h'(t) = 1$, for all $t \geq \delta$, we have $h(t) = t$, for all $t \geq \delta$. Therefore, $h(t) = |t|$, for all $|t| \geq \delta$, as h is even. Finally

$$h''(t) = \tilde{h}'_\varepsilon(t) = 2\rho_\varepsilon(t) \geq 0 \qquad \text{for all} \quad t \in \mathbf{R}. \qquad \square$$

LEMMA 3.2. *Suppose* Ω *is a domain of* $\mathbf{C^n}$. *For* $f, g \in C^k(\Omega)$, $k \geq 2$, *for all* $\delta > 0$, *there is an* $H \in C^k(\Omega)$ *such that*

(i) $H \geq \max(f, g)$ *and*

$$H(z) = \begin{cases} f(z), & \textit{if } f(z) - g(z) > \delta \\ g(z), & \textit{if } g(z) - f(z) > \delta; \end{cases}$$

(ii) *There exists* $|t(z)| \leq 1$, *such that*

$$(H_{ij}(z)) \geq \left(\frac{1 + t(z)}{2} f_{i\bar{j}}(z) + \frac{1 - t(z)}{2} g_{ij}(z) \right), \ \textit{for all} \ \ z \in \{|f - g| < \delta\}.$$

Proof. Note that $\max(f, g) = \frac{f+g}{2} + \frac{|f-g|}{2}$. Let h be the function as in Lemma 3.1. We set

$$H(z) = \frac{f(z) + g(z)}{2} + \frac{h(f(z) - g(z))}{2}.$$

It is obvious that H satisfies property (i). Now we calculate $H_{ij}(z)$:

$$\begin{aligned} H_{i\bar{j}}(z) \quad &= \quad \frac{f_{i\bar{j}}(z) + g_{i\bar{j}}(z)}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\Big\{ h'(f(z) - g(z))(f_{i\bar{j}}(z) - g_{i\bar{j}}(z)) \\ &\qquad + h''(f(z) - g(z))(f(z) - g(z))_i (f(z) - g(z))_{\bar{j}} \Big\} \\ &\geq \quad \frac{1 + h'(f(z) - g(z))}{2} f_{i\bar{j}}(z) + \frac{1 - h'(f(z) - g(z))}{2} g_{i\bar{j}}(z). \qquad \square \end{aligned}$$

We now construct a subsolution v in Proposition 2.1.

Proof of Proposition 2.1. A Lipschitz continuous subsolution can be constructed as in [7]. Let $\psi_0, \ldots, \psi_N$ be the defining functions of $\Omega^*, \Omega_1, \ldots, \Omega_N$ respectively, such that $\psi_j \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}_0)$ and $dd^c\psi_j > 0$ in a neighborhood U_j of $\partial\Omega_j$, for all $j = 1, \ldots, N$. (Note that $\psi_j < 0$ in Ω_j and $\psi_j \neq 0$ on $\partial\Omega_j$.) Since $\bigcup_{j=1}^N \Omega_j$ are holomorphic convex in Ω_0, there is a plurisubharmonic function

ψ in Ω_0, such that $\psi(z) < 0$ in a small neighborhood of $\bigcup_{j=1}^N \partial\Omega_j$ and is positive outside of $\bigcup_{j=1}^N \bar{U}_j$. We may assume that U_j are pair-wise disjoint for $j = 1, \dots, N$, and $\psi \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}_0)$ and $dd^c\psi > 0$ in $\bar{\Omega}_0$. In each U_j, we set

$$V_j(z) = \max\{\varepsilon^2\psi_j, \varepsilon\psi\}.$$

If we pick ε small, we have $V_j(z) = \varepsilon^2\psi_j(z)$ in a small neighborhood of $\partial\Omega_j$ in U_j, and $V_j(z) = \varepsilon\psi(z)$ away from that small neighborhood in U_j. So, we may extend V_j to all of Ω by defining $V_j(z) = \varepsilon\psi(z)$ outside of U_j and $V_j(z) \le 1$ on Γ_1. By applying Lemma 3.2 in U_j, we obtain a smooth strictly plurisubharmonic function H_j such that $H_j = 0$ on $\partial\Omega_j$ and $H_j = \varepsilon\psi(z)$ outside of U_j. Now, we pick λ large so that $1 + \lambda\psi_0$ will be very negative in $\bigcup_{j=1}^N \bar{U}_j$. Set

$$H(z) = \max\{1 + \lambda\psi_0(z), H_1(z), \dots, H_N(z)\}.$$

The function H is taken as a maximum of smooth strongly plurisubharmonic functions, and at no point are there three equal functions involved. Therefore, we can apply Lemma 3.2 near the places where any two of these function meet to obtain a smooth strongly plurisubharmonic function v, such that $v(z) = 1$ on Γ_1, $v(z) = 0$ on Γ_0 and $(dd^c)^n v > 0$ in M^0. □

Proof of the Regularity Theorem 1.1. From the above proposition and Theorem 2.1, there is a sequence of strictly smooth plurisubharmonic functions $\{u^t\}$ satisfying (2.1). By (2.2), there is a subsequence $\{t_k\}$ that tends to 1, such that $\{u_{t_k}\}$ converges to a plurisubharmonic function u in $C^{1,\alpha}(M)$ for any $0 < \alpha < 1$. By the Convergence Theorem for complex Monge-Ampère measures, u satisfies equation (1.1). Again by (2.2), $u \in C^{1,1}(M)$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. If we let $\{u_k\}$ be as in the Regularity Theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_M du_k \wedge d^c u_k \wedge (dd^c u_k)^{n-1} &= \int_{\Gamma_1} d^c u_k \wedge (dd^c u_k)^{n-1} - \int_M u_k (dd^c u_k)^n \\ &= \int_{\Gamma_1} \left(\frac{\partial u_k}{\partial r}\right)^n d^c r \wedge (dd^c r)^{n-1} - \int_M u_k (dd^c u_k)^n.\end{aligned}$$

Since $u_k \to u$ in $C^{1,\alpha}(M)$, $\left(\frac{\partial u_k}{\partial r}\right)^n \to \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}\right)^n$ uniformly on Γ_1. Therefore, by the Convergent Theorem for complex Monge-Ampère measures (see [5]), we get

$$\tilde{N}(\{P_1\}) = \int_M du \wedge d^c u \wedge (dd^c u)^{n-1} = \int_{\Gamma_1} \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}\right)^n d^c r \wedge (dd^c r)^{n-1}. \quad \square$$

Proof of Theorem 1.3. By [7],

$$\tilde{N}(\{\Gamma_1\}) = \int_{\Gamma_1} d^c u \wedge (dd^c u)^{n-1} = \int_M du \wedge d^c u \wedge (dd^c u)^{n-1},$$

and $\tilde{N}(\{\Gamma_1\}) \geq N(\{\Gamma_1\})$ by definition. Also by the Comparison Theorem ([4], [8]), for all $v \in B$ if $v \not\equiv u$, one must have $v < u$ in M^0. By Theorem 2.1 in [7],

$$\int_M du \wedge d^c u \wedge (dd^c u)^{n-1} \leq \int_M dv \wedge d^c v \wedge (dd^c v)^{n-1}.$$

That is,

$$\int_M du \wedge d^c u \wedge (dd^c u)^{n-1} \leq \inf_{v \in B} \int_M dv \wedge d^c v \wedge (dd^c v)^{n-1}.$$

On the other hand, by the Convergent Theorem for complex Monge-Ampère measures

$$\liminf_{k \to \infty} \int_M du_k \wedge d^c u_k \wedge (dd^c u_k)^{n-1} = \int_M du \wedge d^c u \wedge (dd^c u)^{n-1}.$$

That is,

$$\tilde{N}(\Gamma_1) = \int_M du \wedge d^c u \wedge (dd^c u)^{n-1} = \inf_{v \in B} \int dv \wedge d^c v \wedge (dd^c v)^{n-1}. \qquad \square$$

Remark. The main results can be generalized to Stein manifolds without major changes. Estimates C^1 and C^2 can be obtained from the fact that there are finite global holomorphic and anti-holomorphic vector fields that generate $T(M)$. Interior estimates C^2 also follow from Yau [18]. We can obtain C^2 boundary estimates using the same arguments as in this paper, as they are local estimates.

McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada
E-mail address: guan@math.mcmaster.ca

References

[1] E. Bedford, Stability of envelopes of holomorphy and the degenerate Monge-Ampère equation, *Math. Ann.* **259** (1982), 1–28.

[2] E. Bedford and D. Burns, Holomorphic mapping of annuli in $\mathbf{C}^n$ and the associated extremal function, *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa* **6** (1979), 381–414.

[3] E. Bedford and J.-E. Fornæss, Counterexamples to regularity for the complex Monge-Ampère equation, *Invent. Math.* **50** (1979), 129–134.

[4] E. Bedford and A. Taylor, The Dirichlet problem for a complex Monge-Ampère equation, *Invent. Math.* **37** (1976), 1–44.

[5] ———, A new capacity for pluriharmonic functions, *Acta Math.* **149** (1982), 1–40.

[6] ———, Variational properties of the complex Monge-Ampère equation, I. Dirichlet principle, *Duke Math. J.* **45** (1978), 375–403.

[7] ———, Variational properties of the complex Monge-Ampère equation, II. Intrinsic norms, *Amer. J. Math.* **101** (1979), 1131–1166.

[8] L. Caffarelli, J. Kohn, L. Nirenberg, and J. Spruck, The Dirichlet problem for nonlinear second-order elliptic equations, II: Complex Monge-Ampère and uniformly elliptic equations, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **38** (1985), 209–252.

[9] S. S. Chern, H. Levine, and L. Nirenberg, Intrinsic norms on a complex manifold, in *Global Analysis* (*Papers in honor of K. Kodaira*), Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ (1969), 119–139.

[10] C. Fefferman, The Bergman kernel and biholomorphic mappings of pseudoconvex domains, *Invent. Math.* **26** (1974), 1–65.

[11] B. Guan, The Dirichlet problem for complex Monge-Ampère equations and the regularity of the pluri-complex Green function, *Comm. Anal. Geom.* **6** (1998), 687–703.

[12] B. Guan and J. Spruck, Boundary-value problems on S^n for surfaces of constant Gauss curvature, *Ann. of Math.* **138** (1993), 601–624.

[13] P. Guan, C^2 *a priori* estimates for degenerate Monge-Ampère equations, *Duke Math. J.* **86** (1997), 323–346.

[14] P. Guan, N. S. Trudinger, and X.-J. Wang, On the Dirichlet problem for degenerate Monge-Ampère equations, *Acta Math.* **182** (1999), 87–104.

[15] N. Kerzman, A Monge-Ampère equation in complex analysis, in *Several Complex Variables* (Williams Coll., Williamstown, MA, 1975), *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.* **30** (1977), 161–167.

[16] N. V. Krylov, Smoothness of the payoff function for a controllable diffusion process in a domain, *Math. USSR Izv.* **34** (1990), 65–95.

[17] R. Moriyon, Regularity of the Dirichlet problem for the degenerate complex Monge-Ampère equation, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **35** (1982), 1–27.

[18] S. T. Yau, On the Ricci curvature of a complex Kähler manifold and the complex Monge-Ampère equation, I, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **31** (1978), 339–411.

(Received May 15, 2000)